

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



M. H=

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/581,515	07/27/2000	MICHEL PUECH	065691/0194	6785
22428	7590 02/13/2003			
FOLEY AND LARDNER SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW			EXAMINER	
			IMAM, ALI M	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20007		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	
			DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	**7 1
⁶ Advisory Action	09/581,515	PUECH, MICHEL	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ali Imam	3737	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 27 December 2002 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply h places the applicati	to a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The approporiginally set in the final O	n. See MPEP oriate extension priate extension ffice action; or
imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	CFR 1.704(b).		·
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>30 October 2002</u>. A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	•	th in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we 			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examine	er.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	nt(s)(PTO-1449)	·	
10. Other:	M	Stef Lateef	
	Supen	isory Patent Examine Group 3700	er





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner agrees with the applicant's argument that "a 12 mm focal length does not and cannot anticipate 25 mm focal length". However, applicant's independent claims 1, 2, and 5 disclose "a focal length greater than 10 mm". The examiner contends that the applied reference anticipates applicant's claims because 12 mm is greater than 10 mm.